



C3

Single Bench

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Civil Revision No. 252 /2003

APPLICANT : National Insurance Company Ltd.
Defendant No.3 Gil Complex, Near Gurudwara,
Station Road, Durg, Through
Branch Manager, Bilaspur (C.G.).

-Versus –

RESPONDENT : 1. Mohd. Riyaj, 25 years,
Claimant S/o Sirajuddin,
R/o Hatri Bazar, near
Jama Masjid, Durg (C.G.).

RESPONDENT : 2. Ram Kumar @ Atma Ram, 28 years,
Defendant No.1 S/o Guha Ram R/o Chikli,
Indira Nagar, P.S. Pulgaon,
District- Durg

RESPNDENT : 3. Shanti Devi Sharma,
Defendant No.2 W/o Munshi Ram Sharma,
Through Shri Ramlal Sharma,
R/o Ganjpara, Durg (C.G.).

P. R. No. 1550/03
Presented by Shri Prashant Jeetpuri
dated 08/09/03

CIVIL REVISION UNDER SECTION 115 OF THE CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक C.R.252 सन् 2003

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	12.11.2003 Shri Prashant Jaiswal, counsel for the petitioner. Heard on I.A.1716/03 for condonation of delay. Shri Jaiswal submits that the award passed is only for Rs.6000/-. He submits that delay of 72 days has occurred for obtaining final sanction. The reasons as such have not been given. According to the petitioner's own admission, he has not shown sufficient cause in the application nor any documents have been filed in support of his prayer for condonation of such delay. He admits that the application does not contain sufficient grounds. He further submits that the award is for a sum of Rs.6000/- and the appeal does not lie, therefore, this revision has been preferred. The claimants submitted a claim of Rs.2,95,000/- and the Tribunal granted Rs.1500/- towards medical expenses, Rs.2500/- for pain and suffering and Rs.2000 towards loss of income for 15 days. Thus the total amount of award comes toRs.6000/-. According to the counsel, the quantum is not such on higher side. Counsel is also not able to point out any error of jurisdiction. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and material on record and in view of the submission made by the counsel that sufficient cause has not been shown for condonation of delay, revision is dismissed. Consequently, M.C.P.1716/2003 also stands rejected.	Sd/- Fakhruddin Judge

[पीछे देखिये